

REMARKS

The drawings and specification are objected to and the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, § 102 and § 103. In view of the amendments herein and remarks to follow, these objections and rejections are believed to be overcome.

DRAWINGS

Amendment to the specification is made. This objection is believed to be overcome.

SPECIFICATION

An amendment to the specification is made to overcome this objection.

§ 112

Amendments to Claims 3, 4, 6 and 7 are made. It is believed that these overcome these rejections.

§ 102

Claim 3 is amended to recite that the support members, connecting section and supporting sections are coplanar and monolithic. Applicants claimed support rack is advantageous in that it can be constructed from a single piece of wire without any additional elements being added. This is in contrast to Herlevi, et al. (US 6,109,460) wherein spacers 6 extend from a hook 8 in a transverse manner and require fastening together. This is stated in column 3 at line 64. Reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 3 in view of the amendments thereto is requested.

Claim 4 is amended to state that the connecting section is coplanar with the support members and the supporting sections extending essentially perpendicular from the support members. This feature is not found in the shoe display rack of Smith (US 2,902,167) which provides clamps 8 disposed in a parallel manner as well as rack sections 11 and portions 7.

Claim 6 is rejected as being anticipated by Palmer (US 4,974,799). This claim is amended to state that the finger members are constructed and arranged to support a plastic

container on two of the finger members. This feature is not found in Palmer in that the projections 24 which are positioned on a metal rod to support one bag thereon. Further, this claim is amended to state that the suspending support member is defined by a single support arm. In Palmer, two horizontal rods 27 are required. Reconsideration of this claim is requested.

Claim 3 is further rejected over Thomas (US 1,089,882). Claim 3 is amended as initially stated that the support members connecting sections and supporting sections are coplanar and monolithic. This is not found in the Thomas garment hanger, which requires straps 4 to be connected thereto. Further, this claim is amended to recite that the U-shaped members extend in a direction opposite to the lower leg section. The opposite is true in Thomas in that the hooks or tongues 14 extend in a direction toward the other leg members.

As noted by the Examiner, Applicants' support rack is of a simplified construction and fabricated from a single piece of wire. This provides many benefits in cost, manufacturing, as well as use. Reconsideration of the previously discussed claims is respectfully requested.

As to Claims 7 and 8, Claim 6 has previously been distinguished over Palmer. Accordingly, these dependent claims are also believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. If for any reason it is not in such condition, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (262) 631-4583 for a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Dated: 2 April 2004

Correspondence Address:
JohnsonDiversey, Inc.
8310 16th Street - M/S 509
P.O. Box 902
Sturtevant, Wisconsin 53177-0902
Telephone Number: (262) 631-4583

Neil E. Hamilton
Registration No. 19,869